

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

May 8, 2003

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Mimi Doukas called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Mimi Doukas; Board Members Hal Beighley, Jennifer Shipley, and Jessica Weathers. Board Members Cecilia Antonio, Ronald Nardoza, and Stewart Straus were excused.

Senior Planner Steven Sparks, AICP, Consultant John Spencer, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

WORK SESSION:

Work session with staff to review the residential element of the Design Review Process Update. The Design Review Process Update project is developing potential updates to the current design review process and approval criteria for future consideration by the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Code Review Advisory Committee, which is a broad-based community advisory body, has been advising staff on the project which began in December 2002.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks introduced Consultant John Spencer (*Spencer and Kupper*), and explained that Mr. Spencer had assisted staff in their preparation of the draft text for Development Review.

Consultant John Spencer briefly described his background as an urban design planner, noting that he had been involved in the review of numerous projects throughout the area. Observing that this project includes research with regard to the design review process, standards and guidelines involving multiple local jurisdictions, he pointed out that he had worked with staff in the development of proposed standards for the City of Beaverton. He mentioned that several options had been reviewed in an effort to develop standards that are quantifiable, emphasizing that while staff would have the authority to approve an application that meets these standards, any application that does not meet applicable standards would be subject to review through the public hearing process. He pointed out that the level of staff review would be more stringent than the current level of review, adding that staff is working with the Code Review Advisory Committee (CRAC) to prepare and submit a draft proposal.

Mr. Sparks explained that the Board of Design Review would be responsible for the review of the more substantial applications or those with greater impact.

Chairman Doukas expressed her opinion that there would be a great deal of debate because there is a great deal of sensitivity with regard to thresholds, adding that there would also be input from the Planning Commission, who would ultimately be adopting the proposed text for design review.

Mr. Sparks pointed out that although there has not been total agreement with regard to these proposed guidelines, there has been general consensus overall.

Ms. Shipley questioned whether the Board of Design Review has any authority to discourage the type of design featured on the rock walls at Home Depot.

Mr. Sparks noted that *Home Depot* had done a nice job in their efforts at screening, adding that this had included both tree preservation and mature landscaping. Nonetheless, Ms. Shipley's comments could be included in the text.

Mr. Beighley mentioned the *Fred Meyer Store* on Walker Road with regard to screening trees which have been limbed up at the rear of the property.

Mr. Sparks explained that he has issues with some of the storage methods utilized at the *Fred Meyer Store* on Walker Road.

Mr. Spencer mentioned the groups of standards involved in building design, including landscaping, buffering, and lighting standards, and discussed elements of Elevation Design, as follows:

1. Provide articulation and variety for large buildings with three or more attached dwelling units.
2. Provide roof forms as unifying elements for all housing types.
3. Design entrances for safety, convenience and comfort for single-family detached and multi-family developments.
4. Foundation design.
5. Provide high quality materials.

Ms. Doukas requested clarification with regard to the rationale for not classifying concrete as high quality material.

Expressing her opinion that concrete is superior to vinyl siding, Ms. Weathers pointed out that after 25 years, concrete often has attractive and interesting features, such as mosses and other vegetation.

Mr. Spencer explained that most foundation walls are rough and unattractive.

Ms. Doukas pointed out that the issue appears to involve aesthetic features, rather than quality material.

Mr. Sparks mentioned that concrete housing often resembles bunkers.

Ms. Doukas expressed her opinion that an applicant could conceivably argue that concrete conveys an impression of both durability and permanence.

Mr. Spencer explained that the guidelines provide the Board with the discretion to negotiate such issues.

Ms. Weathers noted her disagreement with allowing vinyl but not concrete.

Mr. Sparks emphasized that it is necessary to provide clear and objective standards.

Ms. Weathers mentioned that natural lighting should be encouraged, adding that the Board should have the authority to require a certain amount of windows in a structure. She pointed out that windows provide lighting and ventilation, as well as a potential escape route. She noted that it is also necessary to consider the direction of the sun on different sides of a structure, as well as the exposure to different units.

Ms. Doukas commented that this is an issue that should be addressed by architects.

Ms. Weathers noted that not all buildings are designed by architects.

Mr. Spencer emphasized the necessity of providing quantifiable standards.

7:25 p.m. – Mr. Nardozza arrived.

Ms. Doukas stated that windows have the potential of triggering applications to be reviewed by the Board of Design Review.

Mr. Nardozza mentioned that it is necessary to consider minimal setbacks between buildings and Fire Code.

7:30 p.m. – Ms. Doukas left.

Mr. Spencer referred to parking circulation and discussed vehicular design standards, specifically with regard to locating connections to the public street system and locating loading areas, solid waste facilities and similar improvements out of public view. He also discussed pedestrian design standards for multi-family developments relating to a link to adjacent residential and non-residential areas, abutting public streets, on-site buildings, open spaces and other facilities,

and connecting building entrances to streets. He referred to internal circulation and parking design standards, specifically with regard to providing one landscaped planter island per eight contiguous parking spaces.

Mr. Sparks mentioned the necessity of providing a direct pedestrian connection to the bus.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that this would be addressed through transportation standards.

Mr. Sparks noted that design standards for streets and parking lots are addressed in the transportation section.

Ms. Shipley explained that she has issues with requiring an evergreen hedge without any mix.

Referring to page 2, Mr. Sparks pointed out that this section only mentions a hedge and does not specify that it must be evergreen.

Mr. Beighley stated that it is necessary to determine both the caliper and at which height the caliper must be attained.

Ms. Shipley suggested that the caliper should be attained at the height of six inches.

Mr. Beighley expressed his opinion that the caliper should be at the height of nine inches above the top of the root ball, observing that the caliper should be two inches, rather than 2.5 inches, adding that it is necessary to consider availability. He explained that 92% of these trees are shipped out of Oregon, adding that we are left with the culls. He also suggested that a developer should have the option of planting in the fall, when availability is better, noting that the use of root barriers should be encouraged.

Mr. Sparks pointed out that root barriers had been used for the trees at The Round.

Ms. Shipley questioned whether a list is available indicating which trees are appropriate for planting within the City of Beaverton.

Mr. Sparks advised Ms. Shipley that the arborist has prepared a street tree list to serve as a guide.

Ms. Shipley expressed her opinion that the 48-inch height is restrictive, observing that some very attractive horizontal vegetation is available.

Mr. Spencer suggested that the 48-inch height restriction could be reduced to 30 or 24 inches.

Referring to page 3 of the draft Natural Resource and Open Space Design Standards, Mr. Beighley expressed his opinion that minimizing significant changes to existing on-site surface contours at property lines could be a potential Pandora's Box.

Mr. Spencer discussed the draft Buffering Standards Description, observing that three different landscape standards have been established, as follows:

- B1-Low Screen Buffer
- B2-Medium Screen Buffer
- B3-High Screen Buffer

Ms. Shipley questioned why the B for Buffering is used, noting that L for Landscaping had been used in the past.

Mr. Beighley expressed his opinion that the terminology should be consistent.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.